

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/661,552	KONRAD ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Ishwar (I. B.) Patel	2841	

**All Participants:**

(1) Ishwar (I. B.) Patel.

(2) Burton A. Amernick (Reg. 24,852).

**Status of Application:** Being allowed

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 28 February 2005

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

34 and 36-46

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

*IB Patel*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
(Examiner/SEE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Called applicant's representative as newly amended claims were allowable but were obvious over the claims of the parent case 09/804,921 (patent No 6,730,857) and were subjected to double patenting rejection. Applicant's representative agreed to submit a Terminal Disclaimer...